Chilean Appeal to Ike, P. 3

17 Science Advisors to Democratic Council Say Underground Test Detection Feasible, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VIII, NO. 11 MARCH 21, 1960 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Feeble, Tricky and Transparent

The "working paper on general disarmament" released by the State Department on the eve of the Geneva arms talk is disappointing in manner and substance. As against Khrushchov's reverberating proposal at the UN General Assembly for total disarmament in four years, we turn up a half year later with a "position paper" so vague and complicated no one can tell what it means until after months of negotiation. Even an illiterate Hottentot in darkest Africa will find no difficulty in getting Khrushchov's message—*no more armies in four years*. To understand ours, one would have to hire Sullivan & Cromwell. Khrushchov's offer of total disarmament may have been utopian but it had drama. Ours will put to sleep any audience patient enough to listen through it. From the standpoint of the merchandising arts in which we claim pre-eminence, this is a dismal flop.

Slowly Progressing Backwards

As substance, it is little better. It *is* an improvement over the 1957 "package plan" of John Foster Dulles in that it does not tie all the issues together in an inextricable "take it or leave it" knot; it does not depend on unspecified political solutions; it does not "forbid" the spread of nuclear arms to allies *except* for "defensive" purposes! This new plan, if vaguer, is also roomier in the area allowed for negotiation. But in other respects, it represents a step backward. Let us take the simple issue of the size of the armed forces. Eight years ago, in May 1952, we began by proposing a ceiling of not more than 1,500,000 men each for the armed forces of the U.S., the U.S.S.R. and China. Now we propose force level ceilings of 2.5 million for the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. and a later reduction to 2.1 millions. When we phoned the Pentagon to ask for the latest figure on the U.S. armed forces, the reply was 2,490,035. So we could hire 9,965 more soldiers under the first stage of this disarmament plan! Khrushchov, by comparison, offered a first stage reduction for the Big Three to 1.7 million men each. After all these years of claiming that we had to have nuclear arms to counterbalance Soviet armed "hordes," and insisting that conventional forces must be cut first before we could "ban the bomb," we're talking of bigger armies than the Russians.

More Inspection Than Disarmament

The new proposals are framed to combine a maximum of inspection with a minimum of disarmament: the former is to come early, the latter is left to the sweet bye-and-bye. This is most striking in the question of missiles. These represent the greatest immediate danger to ourselves as well as the Russians. In March 1957 they for the first time offered total abolition of all missiles, intercontinental, intermediate and short range, coupling "complete prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons" with "all types of rockets and artillery" which could be fitted with nuclear warheads. This proposal was included in Khrushchov's speech last Fall, and the Russians offered measures of inspection and control to police such an agreement. But our plan calls in an early stage for the Russians to disclose their missile launching sites to an International Disarmament Organization with "on-site inspection of launching sites," but it leaves the question of eliminating nuclear weapons and delivery systems to the last stage—the stage jokingly referred to in official circles here, as "millennial." Even as to this millennium, the proposal is vague. It speaks of prohibiting the *production* of "nuclear, chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction" but not of prohibiting their use. It speaks ambiguously of "control of the production of agreed categories of military missiles . . . and their final elimination." But if we want to eliminate them, why *control?* And why only *"certain* categories"? No time limit is set for the various stages. It might be years before "control" followed inspection, and years more before "elimination" followed control.

Asking the Russians to Buy A Pig In A Poke

The Russians have always coupled the ICBM with our foreign bases: if they give up the power to bomb us from afar, they want us to give up our power to bomb them from nearby. This plan says nothing of bases. Nor does it mention inspection or control of other nuclear weapon delivery systems such as jet bombers and Polaris-armed submarines in which we may be ahead. The Russians would be asked to disclose their missile bases but with no assurance that both sides would give up nuclear missiles. "In the military domain," says the report of the Scientific Advisory Committee of the Democratic Advisory Council released last Monday (see page 2), "the Soviet Union has a priceless advantage in the concealment of its missile bases. Any uncertainty in the exact location of missile bases adds a high degree of invulnerability to them. This is of immense value to the Soviets and must give them confidence that the U.S. will not strike the first blow." If the positions were reversed, we would not give up such an asset without being certain of a compensatory concession. We ask for the location of missile bases first, but leave the elimination of nuclear missiles vague, though we have as much to gain from this as the Russians. This feeble and transparent dodge reflects the thinking of military men who (1) don't like disarmament anyway, (2) act as if we still had a nuclear monopoly and (3) fail to realize that eliminating the ICBM and other nuclear delivery systems is now essential to our safety and the world's.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Teller "Big Hole" Theory Called Impractical As Means for Evading Detection

Enforcible Atom Test Ban Feasible Say Democratic Scientific Advisers

The Committee on Science and Technology of the Democratic Advisory Council performed a public service on the eve of the resumed Geneva arms talks last week when it released a 6,000-word report declaring an enforcible ban on nuclear tests feasible. The 17 signers* included Harold C. Urey, a Nobel prize winning atomic scientist and Trevor Gardner, a former Assistant Secretary of Defense in the Eisenhower Administration. Highlights of the report:

1. By using robot monitors to provide a grid of seismic stations 250 miles apart, it would be possible to detect nuclear explosions down to 3 kilotons even if muffled by detonating them in underground excavations.

2. This closer spacing would make possible "more precise location of seismic signal origins", limiting the total area to be studied by on-site inspection teams.

Thirty Inspections a Year Suggested

3. "Given the closer grid spacing the number of on-site inspections required per year need not be large, perhaps 30 per year, particularly if a somewhat larger number of aerial inspections are permitted."

4. The present U.S. proposal to allow testing underground "suffers from two major faults: It does not prevent the spread of tested weapons to other powers." "By stipulating a threshold of 4.75 on the seismic magnitude scale without specification of the maximum allowable yield for weapons tested," the U.S. "could, through the use of muffling techniques, test weapons up to 100 kilotons without violating the threshold."

5. Muffling by explosion in large underground cavities reduces the seismic signal but is not a "practical method" of evading test detection. A 70 kiloton explosion would require a 2 to 4 year excavation program cost $25 to $50 million and easily detectable in advance.

6. As for smaller muffled explosions, "In most circumstances an explosion of 1 ton of TNT (1/3 kiloton with maximum decoupling) usually yields an ample seismic signal out to a distance of 400 kilometers [250 miles]. An explosion of ten tons [3 kilotons] is detectible with high reliability within this distance."

7. "It is not necessary for the U.S. to insist upon a 100 percent foolproof system designed to be certain of detecting any nuclear explosion, however small. It is important that significant test series would be likely to be detected. In other words, it is necessary that there be no certain method of defeating the system."

8. "There is a penalty attached to a test ban violator in the form of world opinion which would turn against any nation found guilty of breaking the nuclear agreement. The latter will be no ordinary agreement. It will symbolize a veritable turning point in history . . . A nation which violates such an agreement automatically sets into motion an arms race from which there may never be an end. The notion that a nation could gain some momentary advantage in the arms race by a quick series of tests is fanciful. It takes years to convert test data on weapon innovations into the stockpiled weapons of war."

9. "A test ban does not mean stagnation in weapon design . . . an enforcible test ban could give some advantage to the U.S. because of its greater experience in nuclear weapons."

10. "At best an arms race promises nothing more than a temporary respite . . . a super-arms race takes humanity on a course beset with calamitous pitfalls, unsightly detours and genocidal cul-de-sacs . . . Real security requires control of armaments."

* The other signers were: Dr. Ernest C. Pollard, chairman, biophysics, Yale; Dr. Richard B. Roberts, vice chairman, terrestrial magnetism, Carnegie Foundation; Dr. Samuel K. Allison, physics, Univ. of Chicago; Dr. Harrison Brown, geochemistry, Caltech; Dr. James F. Crow, genetics, Univ. of Wis.; Dr. Louis B. Flexner, medicine, Univ. of Pa.; Dr. H. Bentley Glass, biology, Johns Hopkins; Dr. Leslie C. Dunn, zoology, Columbia; Dr. David R. Goddard, biology, Univ. of Pa.; Dr. Frank Goddard, jet propulsion, Caltech; Dr. David L. Hill, physics, New York; Dr. Polykarp Kusch, physics, Columbia; Dr. F. T. McClure, physics, Johns Hopkins; Dr. John S. Toll, physics, Univ. of Md.; Dr. Gilbert F. White, geography, Univ. Chicago.

The More Arms the More Insecurity

"Never have the peoples of the world spent so much on armament in time of peace and never have they been so insecure. . . . The survival of civilization requires the control of armaments. . . . Insistence upon a perfect system only insures that there will be no inspection and no control. . . . The American and Soviet positions on a test ban are now very close as a result of mutual concessions. Any resolution of the remaining differences is preferable to the dangers which would follow a breakdown of negotiations. The U.S. and the Soviet Union have a strong common interest in preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. Recent Administration suggestions that such weapons be furnished to American allies would . . . jeopardize further negotiations . . . the U.S. should, if necessary, accept considerable risks to achieve the goal of general disarmament in order to avoid the far greater risks attendant upon continuing the arms race."

—Telegram to Secretary Herter signed by 106 members of Johns Hopkins and Goucher Faculties, Mar. 12.

Text of Adlai Stevenson Statement Opposing Resumption of Nuclear Tests

"The recent proposal by some of our leaders that the U.S. resume underground nuclear tests, just when the first break in the arms deadlock seems possible, shocked me. I can think of few better ways to chill the prospects, deface our peaceful image and underscore the Communist propaganda that they are the peacemakers and we the warmongers.

"We should extend our test suspension so long as negotiations continue in good faith and Russia maintains a similar suspension. I am confident that some, at least, of the Russian leaders are anxious to halt testing and development of nuclear weapons before the danger becomes even more uncontrollable. The good faith of the negotiations is, of course, decisive because indefinite suspension amounts to a test ban without inspection.

"There are those who say that disarmament is impossible until political settlements have been reached and confidence restored. I disagree. I believe the nuclear arms race with weapons of mass destruction is a new element and in itself a cause of tension. Fear will not vanish until the arms race is arrested."

—Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, March, 1960.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Latin American "Social Order" A Little Island of Great Wealth in A Vast Sea of Misery

The Appeal Addressed to Eisenhower by the Chilean Student Federation

Except for a story by Murray Marder in the Washington Post March 8, little attention has been paid by the U.S. press to the appeal addressed to the President by the Student Federation of Chile when he visited Santiago Feb. 24. It is an eloquent and memorable document, a cry for understanding from our neighbors to the South. We present a slightly abridged version of the text here this week. We will publish the concluding section, on Castro's Cuba, next week.

"Welcome to Chile. Please accept the cordial greeting of the 25,000 students in the seven Chilean universities. We the University leaders have been elected in a direct vote, both free and secret, and represent all political groups. The majority of us are Christians. And almost all of us, Christians and free-thinkers, are firm supporters of democracy and in opposition to all types of dictatorship. Permit us, then, to express with friendship our thinking on some fundamental aspects of U.S. relations with Latin America.

A One-Sided Partnership

"The relationship between the U.S. and the 20 Latin American nations is framed by a group of treaties. What is the deep political 'philosophy' inspiring all of these agreements? One is very clear: *To establish by legal obligation, Latin American solidarity with the U.S.* In no other [of its international arrangements] does the U.S. obtain more *advantages,* at the same time acquiring fewer *obligations.* The Inter-American system is a regime of obligations accepted by the weak in favor of the strong, and the poor in favor of the rich.

"What can be done? *Recpirocity* and not aid should be the moral basis of the Inter-American System and should materialize in three fundamental ways:

"(1) Military security within the continent by other means than the armed forces (more than $1.5 billions each year are spent by these countries guarding themselves from one another).

"(2) Promotion of democracy. Denying 'salt and water' to the dictators and tyrants in power (such as Trujillo, Somoza and Stroessner) instead of making easy for them the exploitation of their peoples under the pretense that they are 'friends' of the U.S. and 'enemies' of 'communism.'

"(3) An economic integration of Latin America that will permit these countries to industrialize their economies and accelerate their development.

"In none of these three fundamental points has the U.S. assumed the initiative, nor lent its collaboration. This is in sharp contrast with the vigor of the initiative for the work in Europe—the Marshall Plan, NATO, etc.

"Just prices and moral basis for exchange.

"The gap that separates the industrial countries from the nations producing raw materials widens more each year. Industrial nations continue increasing their capital at the expense of under-developed countries, and [their policies] are directed toward 'obtaining foreign raw materials at the lowest price possible' (Pelley Report, 1952).

"If our capitalization *cannot* base itself on the exploitation of other countries, as was the case with Europe for 4 centuries, and it cannot be based on the unmerciful exploitation of our own people as the communist alternative demands, the moral solution demands that it be the product of just prices and adequate remuneration for the raw materials we sell.

At Least Marie Antoinette Offered Cake

Leader of the World's Best Fed Takes Heartening Spiritual Message to the Hungry

"Two-thirds of the population (120 million) live in a chronic state of malnutrition . . . it is a mockery to pretend that this situation reflects the Christian or democratic order for which the immense mass of starved, illiterate and uncultured people, lacking rights, freedom and property, the majority of Latin America, could hope."

—Chilean Student Appeal to Ike, Santiago, Feb. 24.

"You and I believe that each of us is an inviolable spiritual entity . . . more devoted to the protection of human dignity and love of God than to the mere acquisition of material things. . . . Faced with no other choice, we would choose poverty in freedom rather than prosperity in slavery."

—Ike at Sao Paolo, Brazil, luncheon Feb. 25.

A Social Order Not Worth Defending

"In the U.S. and in Western Europe, it makes sense to fight to defend the 'prevailing order,' because there social order represents values which are shared by everybody. In Latin America to 'defend the prevailing order' means maintaining the privileges of a thin layer of the population surrounded by an ocean of poor people for whom the 'social order' means little or literally nothing.

"Two thirds of the population (120 millions) live in a chronic state of malnutrition (FAO); two out of five Latin Americans (70 million) are illiterate (UNESCO); Latin America has the lowest rate of economic development in the Western World (1% a year per capita), or an average income of only U.S. $275 per annum (ECLA).

"If trees are known by their fruit, it is a mockery to pretend that this situation reflects the Christian or the Democratic order. It is a crime against the spirit. If the injustices of today are all that Christianity or democracy can offer this continent, no one should be surprised if the best children of these nations turn toward communism.

The True Face of Our Favorites

"It is true that the U.S. apparently finds its 'best friends' in the small group of privileged Latin Americans to whom the 'prevailing order' in this starved and illiterate America means the right to enjoy a standard of living which would be envied by the multi-millionaires of the U.S. But they are not friends of the U.S.; they are the friends of their own privileges.

"Mr. President: We think that the great mission of the U.S. in Latin America is not to become involved in the 'defense of the prevailing order' but rather [to] encourage by all legitimate means those who fight for the creation of a new social order, closer to Lincoln's immortal definition, 'a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.' "

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New AEC Commissioner Prepared to Resume Testing But No Witness Protests

What's the Good of Public Hearings If The Public Doesn't Participate?

What's the good of public hearings if the public doesn't take advantage of them? The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has just held a hearing on the nomination of Robert E. Wilson, retired Standard Oil (Indiana) executive to a five year term on the Atomic Energy Commission. None of the organizations interested in the crucial public questions he will pass upon showed up to testify.

Wilson was questioned by Senator Anderson about the letter, "Fallout Alarm Unfounded," he sent the *Chicago Daily News* last May (as disclosed in the *Weekly*, March 7.) Wilson indicated that he thinks the fallout danger exaggerated and would be prepared to resume testing in the atmosphere though "anything more than 20 to 25 percent of the past rate," Wilson said, "we would have to look at carefully."

Letters questioning the Wilson appointment on the basis of the views he expressed in the *Chicago Daily News* were received by the committee from Dr. Maurice B. Visscher, Univ. of Minn. physiologist, and Dr. Hugh C. Wolfe, Cooper Union physicist, but they were not read nor were copies made available to the press at the hearing. Both urged the need for a biologist on the AEC. The Joint Committee in executive session afterward voted unanimously to approve the nomination. It now goes to the Senate for confirmation where it will probably be voted with the routine dispatch of a country postmastership.

The Un-Americans: Hat's Off to *The New Yorker* (Mar. 12) for a cartoon by Stevenson showing a pompous Air Force officer shaking hands with a startled Minister as the crowd pours out of church, with the caption "Good sermon, Reverend. I'm going to spread the word around my airbase that in my humble opinion *you're* not one of those Communists." Granted that the Air Force has a right to protect its installations against espionage and sabotage, what business has it policing churches or schools against "dangerous thoughts"?

Another First Amendment defendant, Richard Yellin, graduate fellow at the University of Illinois, was sentenced to the maximum one year in jail for contempt of the House Un-American Activities Committee in Chicago by Federal Judge Swygert . . . Petitions for certiorari in the cases of Frank Wilkinson and Carl Braden were filed in the Supreme Court last week. The issues involve the right of the Committee to punish-by-subpoena those who have been working for its abolition. Richard Arens, staff director of the Committee, accused Wilkinson at his trial of trying to develop "a hostile sentiment" to the Committee. This sounds like *lese majeste* in a new form.

Warren Unna in the *Washington Post* (March 13) disclosed that Arens has been getting $3,000 a year as adviser to New York millionaire Wycliffe Draper in financing genetics studies designed to prove Negro inferiority. Unna pointed out that the La Follette-Monroney Act of 1946 says "professional staff members" of Congressional committees "shall not engage in any work other than committee business." Chairman Walter backed up Arens, declaring "activities after business hours are generally considered to be nobody's business" and Speaker Rayburn told Ronald W. May of the York, Pa., *Gazette* and the Madison, Wis., *Capitol-Times*, who first broke the Arens story, that private employment was only improper if "in any way connected with legislation." Neither interpretation is in accord with the law.

Press Time Bulletin

A project designed further to poison the atmosphere of the Geneva test talks has just been announced by the AEC. It has launched a one-year $1 million construction job to test a 10 kiloton nuclear device in a tunnel 1,100 feet long at the bottom of a 1200 foot shaft in salt beds near Carlsbad, New Mexico. "Project Gnome", planned by Dr. Teller's Livermore lab, is presented as part of the Plowshare project for peaceful uses but this looks more like a test of the Teller "big hole" theory. Until now, in the Louisiana salt mines, the largest test has been a 2,000 pound non-nuclear shot or 2-kilotons. Final authorization by the President will be required, however, before actual detonation and we hope it will not be forthcoming. There is no sure way of separating so-called peacetime uses from data useful for war.

Thanks for the Many Kind Notes With Renewals—They Are Deeply Appreciated

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

3/21/60

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

1 F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone: Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED